

## Summaries At-A-Glance: SAVIN Governance Committee (SGC)

Meeting Date	January 26, 2021
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<p>Members Present: Randi Barretto, Crime Victim Compensation, SGC Chairperson (CVCC – SGC Chair); Julie Ebato, Department of the Attorney General, Crime Prevention and Justice Assistance Division (AG-CPJAD); Angelina Mercado, Hawaii State Coalition Against Domestic Violence (HSCADV); Dayna Miyasaki, Judiciary (JUD); Andrew Morgan, Hawaii Paroling Authority (HPA); Ruth Mori, Maui County Prosecuting Attorney, Victim Witness Assistance Division (Maui VW); Cindy Shimomi-Saito, Sex Abuse Treatment Center (SATC); Suzy Ucol-Camacho, Department of Public Safety, Information Technology (PSD-MIS); Toby Wilson (Victim Representative)</p> <p>Designees Present: Paul Applegate, County of Kauai Police Department (KPD); Deborah Chai, County of Hawaii Office of the Prosecuting Attorney, Victim Witness Program (Hawaii County VW); Dennis Dunn, County of Honolulu, Victim Witness Kokua Services (Hon VWKS); Diana Gausepohl-White, County of Kauai Office of the Prosecuting Attorney Victim Assistance Unit (Kauai County VW); Tommy Johnson, Department of Public Safety, Deputy Director for Corrections (PSD); Edith Quintero, County of Maui Police Department (MPD)</p> <p>Others Present: Rima Ah Toong, Department of Public Safety, SAVIN Coordinator (PSD-SAVIN Coordinator); Nettie Arias (PSD-RAVS); Tani Dydasco (PSD-RAVS); Puna Levenson, (HSCADV); Dawn Martin (CVCC); Tiffany Wood, Appriss, Inc. (Appriss)</p> <p>Members Absent: Susan Ballard, City and County of Honolulu Police Department (Honolulu PD); Paul Ferriera, Hawaii County Police Department (Hawaii PD); Carol McNamee, Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD)</p>
<b>DISCUSSIONS</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>I. <u>Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes</u></b></p> <p><i>DISCUSSION/CONCERN(S)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The December 22, 2020 meeting minutes were reviewed and approved by SGC members.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION PLAN</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator will post the FINAL meeting minutes from December 22, 2020 and the provisional minutes from January 26, 2021 to the PSD SAVIN website.</li> </ul>
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>II. <u>SAVIN Marketing Materials and Swag</u></b></p> <p><i>DISCUSSION/CONCERN(S)</i></p> <p>Swag Distribution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swag orders should be distributed by the end of the week.</li> <li>• An announcement that free swag is available was shared with other victim service agencies not part of the SGC. Additionally, the SAVIN Coordinator and RAVs unit will be providing swag and brochures for both programs to agencies distributing free food in response to the pandemic, and community health agencies.</li> <li>• The SGC Chair asked if the swag order form would still be available on Google and asked if the link and order form could be resent to committee members.</li> </ul> <p>Outreach to Non-English Speakers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator will be working on a plan for outreach to non-English speaking communities in the next few months. The plan will include translating the SAVIN brochure and other marketing materials, as well as targeted outreach to communities that may not be aware of</li> </ul>

	<p>SAVIN services. Once a draft plan is created, it will be shared with SGC members for additional recommendations and feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Dunn (Hon VWKS) volunteered to assist with the outreach.</li> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator noted that there were older version of the SAVIN brochure with translations in Japanese, Tagalog, Korean, and Ilocano.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION PLAN</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator will distribute swag and resend the order spreadsheet.</li> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator will work with the SGC to create an outreach plan to non-English speaking communities.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>III. SAVIN Outage Phone Tree</b></p> <p><i>DISCUSSION/CONCERN(S)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SGC Chair reminded the SGC of the previous discussion about the SAVIN outage procedures.</li> <li>• The draft SAVIN Outage Procedures were submitted to the SGC Chair. The procedures outline the internal steps for PSD to contact the facilities when there is an outage. If the outage is not resolved in a few hours, the SGC will also be notified. There is also a process to check for error notifications during and after an outage.</li> <li>• The SGC Chair noted that the input provided by the SGC about the different county systems to distribute information was helpful in determining the procedure. She asked that SGC members review the procedure and make sure it falls in line with their agency's processes.</li> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator has started documenting known notification issues and will continue to discuss with the SGC when it is appropriate to proactively notify the SGC when issues occur.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION PLAN</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator will distribute SAVIN outage procedures.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>IV. SAVIN User Survey</b></p> <p><i>DISCUSSION/CONCERN(S)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator has been reviewing different types of notifications each month to see how we would expect them to function compared to how they are actually functioning. The presentation includes an analysis of parole-related notifications and results from the SAVIN user survey. The results are being presented together to get a more complete view of SAVIN user experience.</li> <li>• Both analyses will be sent to the SGC after the meeting. The SGC Chair added that the reason for the delay was so HPA and PSD were able to review the information prior to distribution.</li> <li>• Notifications related to parole hearings and minimum setting hearings for the month of November were analyzed. Of the 262 offenders who had those types of hearings scheduled, 93.5% had at least one registration in VINE. Overall, around 90% of all offenders in PSD custody have VINE registrations associated with them.</li> <li>• The 245 offenders had a total of 1,639 registrations. Since VINE is an anonymous system, an individual may be registered for more than one type of notification so the number of registrants do not necessarily represent 1,639 people. However, this means that any data error potentially impacts many people.</li> <li>• Mr. Dunn (Hon VWKS) clarified that people who sign up multiple times are signing up for different methods of notification. For example, a person may initially sign up for notification calls and later for email notifications. The VINE system does not allow duplicate registrations for the same method of notification.</li> <li>• The survey was posted about a year and a half ago. As of December 31, 2020, a total of 619 people have responded. The number of responses is large enough that the findings can be considered representative of all SAVIN users for the questions with large response rates.</li> </ul>

- A broad range of community members use SAVIN. About 22.8% of survey respondents identified as victims, 18.1% identified as family members of victims, and 46.8% identified as an offender family member or friend. However, the free response comments indicate there is a lot of crossover between those groups. For example, the respondents that commented “family member but don’t want to be found by the offender,” or “threatened stepmother” identified as “offender family or friend” but their comments indicate they are using SAVIN for safety reasons as well. More comments are included in the full survey analysis.
- Ms. Wilson (Victim Representative) observed that the percentage identifying as victims or family members of victims was still slightly less than the percentage identifying as offender family member or friend. She noted it would be interesting to see how the results would change if the analysis took into consideration offender family members/friends that feel threatened by the offender.
- The SAVIN Coordinator responded that there was overlap between the different categories. We sometimes hear that “offender family members use SAVIN to track offenders and that isn’t the purpose of SAVIN.” However, the survey shows no matter how people identify they rely on SAVIN notifications for safety reasons.
- Ninety-six (96.3%) percent of SAVIN users agreed that having the SAVIN system available made them feel safer. Respondents shared great stories of how SAVIN helped them.
- Ms. Wilson (Victim Representative) asked if any of the 3.7% that answered they didn’t feel safer with SAVIN gave a reason why. The SAVIN Coordinator responded that both the parole-related notification analysis and the survey had a lot of positive and negative results. The vast majority of users agree that the system is working well for the most part, but there is room for improvement. The SGC has identified a lot of the issues already, but now we have them in black and white and can begin to really work on finding solutions. We can take a system that is already working well, and make it work really well. Many comments were included in the survey analysis appendix so SGC members could get a good understanding of SAVIN users’ experience. Ms. Wilson (Victim Representative) stated it seemed like her question would be addressed later in the presentation.
- Most users agree that notifications are accurate and timely. The responses varied a little by method of notification, but overall, between 81% and 91% agreed.
- A single notification error can potentially impact many SAVIN users. In November 2020, parole hearings were held for 7 offenders, but no decision notification was sent. As a result, 68 SAVIN registrants did not get informed of the parole hearing decision. There also was one (1) data entry error. For one (1) offender, a minimum setting hearing was not held but a decision notification was sent out to the 12 SAVIN registrants associated with that offender. This demonstrates that the error rate has to be as close to zero as possible.
- Many SAVIN users are seeking additional information and assistance after receiving a notification. Three hundred twenty-four (324) respondents reached out to a facility and 303 called PSD’s main administrative office. However, survey respondents didn’t necessarily distinguish between HPA and PSD, so the responses for those questions overlap.
- The most common reasons why a caller’s needs were not met included difficulty reaching a live person, PSD/HPA staff not returning calls, lack of sensitivity/poor communication, and general confusion about where to find information. The responses show what we are trying to build is needed – a warm handoff and bridge between SAVIN, the Post-Conviction Advocate at CVCC, the RAVs program, and other agencies so users get connected to additional information and support.
- The SGC Chair asked if notifications include a phone number users can contact for more information. The SAVIN Coordinator responded that there are contact numbers, but they may need to be updated as they were chosen before PSD had victim assistance staff. PSD has been reviewing all the notification scripts to make sure SAVIN users are directed appropriately.
- The SGC Chair asked if the changes have been brought up with Appriss. The SAVIN Coordinator answered that they are aware, and we have a draft of the scripts with those changes notated. Script changes take several weeks so the request was put on hold until after the RFP process is completed.
- The areas for improvement identified in the analyses mirror current SAVIN priorities and what PSD and the SGC is already trying to

accomplish.

- Ms. Gausepohl-White (Kauai County VW) commented that we need to determine the appropriate remedy for missed notifications that impact a victim's statutory right to submit testimony at a parole hearing. Remedies may include HPA holding another hearing. The SAVIN Coordinator agreed and stated reviewing the data is step one. The next step is to figure out why the issues are happening, and then determine what should be done in response.
- The SAVIN Coordinator gave a brief overview of the parole hearing analysis. The key on the bottom right-hand side identifies two categories – "error" and "area for improvement." However, it would be more accurate to say both indicate places where there are questions and additional information may be needed.
- The SGC Chair stated that it was great to have the data available and to see that the system is working. However, there are still deficiencies that we need to address. It is important to acknowledge that these are individuals who may not be receiving the information they need.
- There were 222 parole hearings scheduled for the month of November. For those offenders, there were 25 victims listed in the HPA database to be notified directly by HPA. Two hundred and six (206) of the offenders had registrations against them in VINE; together there were 1,377 registrations against those offenders. Each offender has an average of 6.7 VINE registrations.
- The analysis looks at what we would expect to happen at each notification point, what actually occurred, and how many registrants were impacted. For example, if someone is scheduled for a parole hearing, was a 14-day advanced hearing notification sent? The analysis then branches out to next notification event and reviews whether that notification was sent.
- About half of the 14-day advanced hearing notifications were not sent out 14 days ahead of time. The average number of days they were sent before the hearing date was 12.3.
- Seven of the 44 people who were initially scheduled for a hearing in November had their hearing postponed and a hearing delay notification was not sent. For the 37 offenders whose registrants did receive a hearing delay notification, most were sent out the same day as the original hearing was scheduled, or after. HPA staff do not always know that a hearing will be delayed ahead of time. This may be due to facilities closing due to COVID, offenders not wanting to participate, or other reasons. This is an instance where the SAVIN program can provide more information to SAVIN users about the parole process and that hearings may be rescheduled frequently.
- Ms. Mori (Maui VW) asked if the advanced hearing notifications can be sent more than 14-days before the hearing date. The VWs usually get 30-day advanced notification from HPA when minimum term and parole hearings are scheduled. The SAVIN Coordinator agreed that it was a short amount of time and the system may have been configured that way based on the language of the statute. However, it the timeframe can be adjusted if the SGC determines it is necessary.
- The SGC Chair added that the analysis allows us to have those discussions with HPA. The discrepancies are no one's fault. We can look at the information and determine if there needs to be more training, better understand how HPA is using the information and if we need to adjust the notification triggers, and what else may need to be changed.
- Ms. Chai (Hawaii County VW) noted that if there is an incorrect notification, it would be good if a correction notification was sent out. In other words, "oops, we made a mistake, defendant is still in custody." The SAVIN Coordinator answered that that is a conversation we can have with the vendor. Currently, the SAVIN system does not have that capacity.
- T. Wood (Appriss) stated that there was an option to do bulk "alert express" notifications that we can explore.
- Mr. Dunn (Hon VWKS) asked if the SGC could do a walkthrough of the triggers and timing for all the notification types during one of the meetings. There may be systemic issues that we aren't seeing because we are looking at each type of notification individually. It could even be a subcommittee where everything is reviewed including the timing of each notification. The SAVIN Coordinator agreed and stated similar analysis will be done for all the different notification "pathways."
- Ms. Wilson (Victim Representative) asked if extenuating circumstances, such as the pandemic and mandated early release of offenders,

	<p>were occurring during November that may have impacted notifications. The SAVIN Coordinator confirmed the analysis may be skewed due to the unusual circumstances. For example, there were some hearings that were cancelled last-minute because the facility closed due to COVID-19. How notifications functioned in November likely is not a “typical” representation of how notifications function other months. However, the analysis does reflect the circumstances we have been experiencing the past year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Wilson (Victim Representative) concurred that while the pandemic may be skewing things, we still need to make things as best as possible so that we are providing the optimal services we can provide. She then asked why there was such a large discrepancy between the number of victims tied to offenders in HPA’s database and the number of registrants in VINE. Mr. Johnson (PSD) responded that part of the discrepancy may be that there may be registrants from older offenses still attached to that offender.</li> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator also commented that the victims in HPA’s database may be the defendant in a case. Mr. Johnson (PSD) clarified that HPA only includes the victim if they contact HPA and ask to be notified, as required by statute.</li> <li>• Ms. Wilson (Victim Representative) asked if that meant there were a lot of offenders in the system who committed an offense but did not necessarily have a victim associated with the offense. Mr. Johnson responded that it could occur because the victim did not want to be notified or that the victim did not want to participate in the prosecution. This happens frequently in domestic violence cases.</li> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator stated that people are less likely to proactively contact an agency and ask to be notified may be more likely to sign up for SAVIN as it is anonymous.</li> <li>• Ms. Gausepohl-White (Kauai County VW) commented that the individuals listed in HPA’s database are restricted to the victims in the case. Other individuals like family members can sign up for SAVIN, so that may contribute to the discrepancy.</li> <li>• The survey analysis includes a summary of survey findings and an appendix with each question and many of the comments. Duplicate and “not applicable” comments were excluded.</li> <li>• To address Ms. Wilson’s (Victim Representative) earlier question about comments from survey respondents that did not agree notifications were timely and accurate, the SAVIN Coordinator shared some comments where users expressed confusion or reported getting conflicting information through notifications. Additionally, there were some comments from SAVIN users that felt lack of/incorrect notifications were detrimental to their safety.</li> <li>• The SGC Chair asked if there needs to be revisions to some of the questions. The SAVIN Coordinator answered that some questions could use revision. However, since the survey has been up for a year and a half and we have robust data, it may be more beneficial to keep it as is. The SGC Chair agreed to keep the questions as-is for the now.</li> <li>• The SGC Chair reminded committee members to provide feedback on the analyses.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION PLAN</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SGC members will review the analyses and provide feedback.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>V. Monthly SAVIN Reporting</b>  <i>DISCUSSION/CONCERN(S)</i>  SAVIN data tracking and training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were 21 system tests conducted in November, including 19 Resynchronization Reports (Resyncs) and 2 manual data quality tests.</li> <li>• Eleven of the Resyncs (11) resulted in missed notifications that needed to be manually checked by PSD. From those, 15 notifications were approved and 36 were rejected.</li> <li>• The two (2) manual data checks were presented earlier.</li> <li>• There was one (1) Appriss ticket opened in December, and progress was reported on five (5) open tickets. Several tickets were related to the “release” and “return to custody” issue discussed last month. The fix for that issue has already been implemented. Two (2) are to research how HPA notifications are triggered. One (1) ticket was a browser compatibility issue.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appriss is still testing ways to ensure photos are picked up correctly in VINE.</li> <li>• There were 22 calls to Appriss Victim Service Representatives (VSRs) during the month and 17 email requests for additional support. The topics included: add to allow list – 25, search for an offender – 5, add a registration – 2, delete notification/stop notification – 1, notification question – 1, agency referral – 1, application error – 1, general product inquiry – 1, and dead air – 2.</li> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator had an initial meeting with Appriss to go through a draft training presentation and a second meeting is scheduled for February. The goal is to roll out training to PSD facility staff in March.</li> <li>• The priorities for February are to continue mapping out the different notification pathways and to finalize the PSD facility training presentation.</li> </ul> <p>SAVIN Inquiry Reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inquiry status definitions were updated to “pending” and “closed” to be more accurate.</li> <li>• One (1) SAVIN inquiry form was received in December related to HPA notifications which was already being reviewed. One (1) inquiry form received in October is still “open” and three (3) are pending as of the end of December. The inquiries that were forwarded to Appriss for further research have been open for an average of 92.25 days. Another inquiry related to HPA data that was not forwarded to Appriss has been open for more than 20 days. When a system issue is identified, it does take a while to get resolved. That is an area for improvement.</li> </ul> <p>SAVIN Special Funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator thanked Ms. Mori (Maui VW) for her question at the last meeting about MCCC’s collection. There was a miscommunication between MCCC and PSD’s Fiscal Office that has been resolved. MCCC is reviewing their prior SAVIN collections to determine if additional funds need to be transferred into the SAVIN account.</li> <li>• Each of the facilities will be contacted to review their SAVIN collection process. A protocol may be developed for all facilities, if necessary.</li> <li>• The new telephone contract increased SAVIN collections from \$200,000 per year to 40% of all revenue. However, it is submitted by the telephone vendor as a lump sum and may not be available by facility.</li> <li>• There were slightly more expenditures in December, but the SAVIN fund balance is still increasing. As of December 31, 2020, the SAVIN fund balance was \$1,555,888.52.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION PLAN</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator will follow-up with other facilities and their SAVIN collection process.</li> <li>• PSD will continue to conduct analysis on how different types of notifications function.</li> <li>• The SAVIN Coordinator will work on developing a training plan and to update training materials and “cheat sheets.”</li> </ul>
	<p><b>VI. SAVIN RFP Status</b></p> <p><i>DISCUSSION/CONCERN(S)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The deadline for the RFP passed, and PSD got fewer responses than we had hoped for. PSD is determining what the next steps will be.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION PLAN</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSD will continue to move forward with the RFP on an accelerated timeline.</li> </ul>

<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:13 a.m.</li></ul>
<b>NEXT MEETING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The next meeting is tentatively set on Thursday, February 25, 2021, via Teams (9:00 am -10:30 am)</li><li>• JRI Workgroup Meeting on Tuesday, February 23, 2021, via Teams (10:30 am - 12:00 pm)</li></ul>

Draft submitted: 3/3/2021